

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

STEVEN CURTIS BACHMEIER,

Petitioner,

v.

SPRING CREEK CORRECTIONAL
CENTER,

Respondent.

Case No. 3:25-cv-00075-SLG-MMS

ORDER RE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court at Docket 1 is Petitioner Steven Bachmeier's Petition Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus. The petition was referred to the Honorable Magistrate Judge Matthew M. Scoble. At Docket 6, Judge Scoble issued his Report and Recommendation, in which he recommended that the petition be dismissed without prejudice. No objections to the Report and Recommendation were filed.

The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). That statute provides that a district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge."¹ A court is to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge's report

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.”² However, § 636(b)(1) does not “require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”³

The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court dismiss without the Petition Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus. The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and agrees with its analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation, and IT IS ORDERED that the Petition Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of Habeas Corpus is DISMISSED without prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall enter a final judgment accordingly. A Certificate of Appealability shall not issue.⁴ Petitioner may request a certificate of appealability from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

DATED this 4th day of June, 2025, at Anchorage, Alaska.

/s/ Sharon L. Gleason
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² *Id.*

³ *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).

⁴ 28 U.S.C. §§ 2255(d), 2253(c)(2). *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (certificate of appealability may be granted only if applicant made a “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right,” i.e., a showing that “reasonable jurists could debate whether . . . the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further” (internal quotations and citations omitted)).